Dear Howard, 7/25/80

If Bill had not mislaid your letter I'd have responded sooner. In part because you are equivocal in it. While you imply that I ought not make a direct approach to Fielding you fall short of saying this. Probably if I don't hear from you recommending against it I'll write him before too long.

The ACLU is pie in the sky, as is anything involving Jim. Alas.

If you can make any suggestions, please do.

I'm at a loss to understand the ACLU's attitude, meaning that of all their people. Except, perhaps, one, Shattuck. I saw him in New York some years ago and he appeared to be quite interested. He introduced me to Wulf and asked me to write him a detailed letter, which I did. I spoke to at least two of the people who headed the DC office, the last Lawrence Speiser some years ago, when Bud took us to lunch, as I recall. I've never spoken to any of the others, including the current crop. I've seen Mark Lynch only once, when Jim pointed him out in the appeals court room, with Diana Cohn. She made reference to my FOIA experiences, I do not know on what basis because she never asked or spoke to me. Thus also she lost the considerable value of what happened after as a result of her complaint to the Senate FOIA committee Civil Division made public promises. Maybe she is Nader. To me tyey are all nadir as humans.

The newest vexatious harassment is cancelling the fee waiver, even with regard to cases in litigation and ancient requests. Doing what I can now and preparing have taken considerable more time and will take much more. Jim has done nothing yet and where he's made promises to do certain things promptly, then by stated dates, he's failed. Even when they have primary and basic importance in the yardarm case, King, which he's messed up more than the judge has.

I'm making what efforts I can to reflect my appreciation. If everything goes right there will be an Anderson columnitem on it. The Post is supposedly working on a story that should make page 1, exposing the FBI's involvement in the Greenwich Village explosion, the Weatherman/Wilkerson case, and the LA Times on another, on how the FBI persuaded LBJ that the CIA was involved in a plot to kill JFK. If the Post doesn't do something soon I'll go elsewhere. But they have made a major staff investment in the Billy Carter matter, one day's accounts holding 10 staff credits.

Maybe I'll think of more. If I set myself to it I could. But with my long absence from Washington I have fewer contacts, so I have to work from here, by phone. And I hate the fact that my life has wound up as a fight which has ended my productivity. If it were not for Jim's urgent need for the fees I'd just drop out of most if not all the cases. He is constitutionally unable to fight. (He's had a seriousnreverse in his OPR case, one I urged him not to appeal. He filed it without consulting me and when he did file it he should have done it for me because it is an offshoot of my King case. He forced the wrong case to the inevitable conclusion. I particularly warned him about the care with which Gesell had drafted his opinion, but he would not listen.) I find myself in basic agreement with the appeals court, except where it was deceived by government lies.)

I'm losing Rae, which will limit me more because slowly but steadily I grow less able

Dave and his family were here. We enjoyed their visit much. The kids are beautiful and we enjoyed them, too.

Glad your move appears to have been good and that the work appears to be exciting. Hope Duane latches on to something he likes. You can't be far from Paul Wurtzel because you have the same zip code.

Good luck,